

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed September 10, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The application as presented is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Response to Restriction

The Office Action contends that the previously pending claims included claims to two distinct inventions, i.e., Group I (claims 2-6 and 10) to a method of storing a digital asset in a digital repository, and Group II (claim 13) to a method of deleting a digital asset from a digital repository. Applicants hereby elect Group I without traverse. Claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Applicants reserve the right to continue to pursue the subject matter of this claim in one or more divisional applications. The remaining claims under examination belong to Group I.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 2-6, 10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C., second paragraph for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention.

More specifically, the Office Action contends the phrase “generating a generated cryptographic hash identifier” as previously recited in claims 2, 3, 6, and 10 was unclear. Claims 2, 3, 6, and 10 have been amended to recite in part, “generating a **second** cryptographic hash identifier” to select a new label (i.e., “second” rather than “generated”) to distinguish the cryptographic hash identifier that is generated from the “broadcast” cryptographic hash identifier that is received. It is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 2, 3, 6, and 10 be withdrawn.

It is believed that the rejection of claims 4 and 5 was based solely on their dependency from claim 3. Thus, the rejection of claims 4 and 5 should be withdrawn for the same reasons.

Claim 13 has been canceled.

CONCLUSION

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph were the only rejections made. Those having been overcome, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: December 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Richard F. Giunta
Registration No.: 36,149
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000